DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 217 SP 006 580

TITLE	Instructional Innovation and the Local Association.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Div. of Instruction and Professional Development.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	48p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, Instruction and Professional Development, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational Innovation; Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Innovation; *Professional Associations; *Teacher Associations; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

This information package contains five of seven reports on efforts to introduce instructional innovations into the school systems. The first report deals with the role of the association in implementing innovations. The points stressed are negotiating contracts with school boards, keeping abreast of school district and state education department policies, and providing help to teachers in procuring the resources necessary for change. The second report contains excerpts from a National Association (NEA) conference "The Professional Association and its Role in Instruction." The report presents examples of what local associations have done to ensure teacher participation in instructional development and innovation. The third report is a summary of the Ford Foundation analysis entitled "A Foundation Goes to School," which describes the $30 million effort to improve education in the 1960s. The fourth report presents information o teacher centers and their involvement in curriculum and program changes. The last report is a Briefing Memo from NEA on a new approach for keeping teachers. informed of innovative developments. A three-page bibliography for the entire information package is presented. (BRB)

professional excellence

The Charter of the National Education Association states the purpose of the nation's largest independent professional organization: "To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States."

To carry out this purpose more effectively, the NEA, through its Representative Assembly, has established a number of long-range goals. This document, prepared by the NEA staff for Instruction and Professional Development, represents a part of the effort of the Association to achieve one of these goals: *professional excellence.*

For more information about our program on professional excellence, write or call Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Phone: (202) 833-4337.

James W. Becker, director
Instruction & Professional Development
National Education Association

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084217

INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION AND THE LOCAL ASSOCIATION

This document has been prepared by the Instruction and Professional Development Staff of the National Education Association. It contains Parts III through VIII of an eight-part information package on this topic.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 006 580

March 1973

National Education Association
Instruction and Professional Development
1201 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

(With the exception of the articles reprinted here from Today's Education and the Phi Delta Kappan, the contents of this document are not copyrighted and may be reproduced in full or in part provided credit is given to the National Education Association.)

CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . . 6 pages

Part III*
The Local Association: Its Impact on Innovation . . . . . 4 pages

Part IV
The Professional Association Looks At Its Role in Instruction . . . . . 18 pages

Part V
When A Foundation Goes to School . . . . 3 pages

Part VI
"Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here? . . . . . 4 pages

Part VII
"Open Schools and the Teacher" (Briefing Memo) . . . . . 4 pages

Part VIII
Bibliography . . . . . 3 pages

*Part I, Part II
A Foundation Goes to School and the cassette, "Innovations and the Local Association," are enclosed in the package outside this document.

INTRODUCTION

This information package brings together from several vantage points a collection of reports on efforts--successful and otherwise--to introduce into the schools instructional innovations that might have made a lasting difference in the quality of teaching and learning. From this mixed bag of hope and despair, one certainty stands out for leaders of the united teaching profession: professional excellence can be achieved in a real and continuing sense only through action of the profession itself.

In addition to the material gathered into this document and listed on the preceding page, this package includes an audio tape cassette recording of local teacher association leaders today, who can be heard giving their own views and experiences on this topic. Also included is the 52-page Ford Foundation report, A Foundation Goes to School, which describes and assesses the Foundation's Comprehensive School Improvement Program from 1960 to 1970.

When considered together, the eight enclosed information modules lead to several conclusions of obvious and practical interest to association leaders who are committed to working with their constituents for professional excellence. First, and most important, is the matter of teacher involvement in any planned instructional innovation, involvement that begins at the outset and that is a continuing professional

involvement throughout. Such teacher involvement in most cases should span the experimental gamut from design to direct participation in a statement of findings, conclusions, and recommendations. No matter how "unstructured" it may appear in practice, instructional innovation by its very nature must involve the teacher as planner, evaluator, arbiter, and decision maker.

But since teachers acting singly usually have a small voice and little influence, a second conclusion to be drawn from this information package has to do with the need for a strong, well-organized local teacher organization. It is only through the considered, professional action of the local teacher association that the necessary involvement of individual members with innovative and experimental programs can be assured. In other words, teacher participation in programs for instructional innovation can most effectively be accomplished through local association action. Important and self-evident, yes; but this conclusion reflects only one dimension of the local association's role in the quest for professional excellence.

When considered in detail, the materials in this package raise a series of fundamental questions each local association must face up to and resolve as a matter of policy and strategy. First is the matter of professional excellence and its

relationship to innovation. Can the teaching profession achieve its goal of professional excellence simply by doing better what we are already doing? In other words, are there fundamental weaknesses in the organization, support, and administration of schools that often make a mockery of instructional innovation in the classroom?

Other questions of some interest to the local association include its leadership role in the move for professional excellence. To what extent should the local association take the responsibility to initiate change to improve instruction? Such a question is fundamental when considered in relation to the matter of professional self-governance. Related to this, of course, is the matter of finance. Where do the funds come from to support such innovation? Where should they come from? If we have learned anything from the history of innovation in schools, it is that instructional change cannot be effectively accomplished by simply throwing money at learning problems. The implications here for the role of the local association are of great importance and not unrelated to the prior questions.

Before one considers the content of this information package in detail, it will be useful to see what we have included and why we have included it:

I. A Foundation Goes to School. The recent Ford Foundation's report which analyzes in detail the

results of its $30 million effort to improve public education during the decade of the 60's.

II. Audio cassette: "Innovations: The Teacher and the Local Association." Two teachers, who are members of their local association's council on instruction and professional development, discuss with an NEA staff member some of their concerns and experiences that relate innovations to the role of the teacher and the association.

In addition to the cassette and the Ford Foundation publication, the other materials in this information package have been assembled as a part of this document and prepared for use in a three-ring binder. They include:

III. "The Local Association: Its Impact on Innovation." This practical, hard-hitting discussion raises some down-to-earth issues for the local association leader who must develop appropriate tactics for action.

IV. "The Professional Association Looks at Its Role in Instruction." Excerpted from an earlier association report, this condensation includes examples of what some local associations have already done to insure teacher participation in instructional development and innovation.

V. "When a Foundation Goes to School." This reprint from the March 1973 issue of Today's Education is a summary of the Ford Foundation report (See I above) by Edward J. Meade, Jr., program officer in charge of public education, Ford Foundation.

VI. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" This provocative piece by Paul S. Pilcher appeared originally in the January 1973 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, and makes a strong case for teacher participation in decisions about curriculum and program. Pilcher argues for changes in the educational establishment which now decides what the teacher's role shall be. (More information on the IPD/NEA Teacher Center program is available from our office.)

VII. "Open Schools and the Teacher," Briefing Memo on instruction and professional development. This new approach to keeping teachers informed of innovative developments is enclosed. For details on this publication, note the information printed in the "box" on page 4 of the Briefing Memo.

VIII. Bibliography.

The commitment and concern of the National Education Association for professional excellence and for the improvement of instruction can be found again and again in the association's programs and in the resolutions adopted by its Representative Assembly. See, for example, pages 53-56 of the 1973 NEA Handbook.

Since we want to make these information packages as useful as possible to association leaders, a self-addressed postal card is enclosed for your use. Please return it to us with your comments. Thank you.

James W. Becker

James W. Becker, Director
Instruction and Professional
Development
National Education Association

Part III

The Local Association: Its Impact on Innovation

For many years teachers have been voicing demands for reasonable limitations on class size. Teachers, because of their professional training, experience, and common sense, have long been aware of what they need to do a better job of teaching. They've known that smaller classes permit a more effective teacher-learner relationship, that smaller classes can promote greater student achievement. Teachers have called for more reasonable class size, but few school boards have listened. Now there are specific research data[1] that indicate what teachers have known all along: that smaller classes can, indeed, make a difference.

Now teachers are finding themselves in the same position regarding educational innovations. For years teachers have endured and occasionally fought change that was being imposed by the curriculum director, the superintendent, the inanimate central office; change that was directed from the top of the typical school district hierarchy; change which ultimately went nowhere because of the lack of commitment and even understanding of those teachers designated to accomplish the change. Sometimes a facade of innovation was successfully established, but significant lasting change was minimal if it occurred at all.

We read the evaluation of the Ford Foundation's[2] decade of participation in school experimentation and find out again what teachers have known all along and could not get across to school administrators and school boards: if real change is to take place,

teachers must be involved and that involvement must necessarily be at all phases of the innovation process, from idea conception to program evaluation.

The findings of the Ford study, then, that the potential success of change is directly dependent on the active participation of the teacher (as well as parents and students) add additional credibility to the positions teachers and teacher associations have consistently taken and continue to take. Unfortunately, the teacher-practitioner too often has not been listened to very seriously. Now we have the prestige of the Ford Foundation which clearly reinforces the teacher and association position.

The implications of all of this for the teacher is that he/she must be involved in the whole spectrum of change--in idea conception, needs assessment, data interpretation, consideration of and decisions on alternative approaches to attain specific objectives, planning for implementation, implementation, and program evaluation. The responsibility of the local association is to see that such involvement takes place and that necessary resources are made available to support a mandated change, or the association must see that change is not initiated.

It stands to reason if there is little chance for effective change to occur then it is a waste of time, money, and other resources to go through motions that can lead only to futility and frustration.

What specifically should the association do?

1. The association must have a negotiated master contract with the school board establishing clearly the rights, working conditions, and opportunities for achieving

professional excellence for the teachers in the district. This is critical; if teachers are expected to be involved in change, they must have well established job security and clearly defined responsibilities. The typical school district is a highly political entity, and can be very threatening to parts of the community, the school district, and to the teacher. The teacher must be free to change and be secure in change. The master contract can help to provide the environment that engenders change, but also adds some controls to insure that innovation is meaningful and not just a public relations device.

2. The association must make sure that the district provides the necessary resources for all phases of the change-making process. Such resources would be staff, consultants, money, materials, visitation time, in-service training--in short, whatever is necessary to do the job. The key here is that the association provides a vehicle by which teachers help to determine what is necessary and then the association makes sure the district provides it.

3. The association must always know what is going on within the school district and the state department of education. Who is planning what change is an intelligence function of the association. The association cannot hope to influence what is going on unless it is aware of it in the first place. The means to keep abreast of innovative planning at the district and state level, then, must be developed by the local.

4. The association, once it has seen to it that the district is providing the best environment for change to take place, must constantly monitor those changes for implications to teachers and education. The association must maintain a position of influence on the nature of the change to reinforce it, to redirect it, or to kill it.

5. The association must insure that the decision-making on innovations is clearly defined and that the association through its teacher members is represented in the process. Because there is no one way to Nirvana, this could be accomplished through an association committee, a joint educational council, an ad hoc task force, or any other appropriate group. In any case, the association must appoint its members to such groups and these members must be accountable to the association.

6. The Ford Foundation determined that parents and students must also be an integral part of educational change. The association can be a focal point for such parent and student involvement. It is in the association's best interest to do so. The association is in a good position to

do so because it is already organized and is already an advocate group. The association can see that the district involves both parents and students or the association can do the involving of parents and students. In either case, there is a bridge building process that can take place among parents, students, and teachers which has profound implications for real educational change and definite implications for a more vital community role for the association.

7. The association must see that there is a clear understanding by everyone that change may succeed or fail in terms of its objectives; that some phases of program change may succeed or fail. The main point is that a program is free to succeed or fail and that the important consideration is understanding why. Without such consideration, educational innovation remains just the catchy educational jargon that it has been.

In summary, the local association as an advocate for its teacher members must always be in a position to influence anything that occurs in the school district affecting its teacher members.

Given the appropriate environment and leadership, teachers are able and willing to change, to try new and/or different instructional approaches. Providing the appropriate environment is the responsibility of the district. Determining what that appropriate environment is and seeing that the district provides it is the responsibility of the association.

---

[1] Olson, Martin N. "Ways to Achieve Quality in School Classrooms: Some Definitive Answers." *Phi Delta Kappan* 53: September 1971. pp. 63-65.

[2] *A Foundation Goes to School.* The Ford Foundation Report, 1972. Included as part of this package on innovations.

THE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION LOOKS AT ITS ROLE IN INSTRUCTION

Contents

Introduction . . . . . p. 1

Conference Highlights . . . . p. 2

Local Association Projects in Instruction . . . . . p. 6

Negotiation: Decision Making Process in Instruction . . . . . p. 12

INTRODUCTION

In April 1970 local, state, and national leaders held a joint conference in Washington, D.C. to assess the status, progress, and plans—at all levels—of professional development and instructional improvement.

This condensed report contains excerpts taken from the full conference report:

The Professional Association Looks at Its Role in Instruction

National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Published 1970

Stock No. 761-06254
Single copy, $1.25

The full report contains the possible design of developments wherein teachers, along with all other educators, may realize their potential for improving classroom practices and curricular substance. How rapidly the design can be or will be installed no one can foresee at present, but the conferees were enthusiastic about their roles as planners and surveyors.

The conference combined in a new realm of collaboration the national, state, and local professional associations of teachers. They saw their future roles as joint engineers in keeping the lines up, the switchyards clear, the transformers cool, and the power boosted and distributed. No clearer picture of their service function could have been drawn. Even so, when the outlines of the network came into view, it was recognized that the original sources of power were still the individual teacher cells in the local units. These would remain the generators for long into the future.

* * * * *

The following excerpts of this conference report represent an "action" component of "Instructional Innovations and the Role of the Local Association." It is a look at what some local education associations have done. It also includes some negotiation examples which led to teacher participation in their own professional development to ensure sound instructional change.

The Conference focused on the structure, processes, and relationships of a professional association as it seeks to become an effective voice of its members in the improvement of teaching and learning.

Among the several purposes of the opening Conference session, two stand out as particularly important at this time for the local education association to consider in a push toward professional excellence.

1. To examine the potential use of professional negotiation as an instrument of association policy and action for improving curriculum and instruction. When and how is negotiation used effectively in decision making involving the instructional program?

2. To identify the processes and strategies which can be used by the association for instructional change. How are needs diagnosed, priorities established, resources utilized, barriers overcome, accountability planned for, and relationships strengthened with other groups inside and outside the school system?

AS THE PROFESSION LOOKS AHEAD

Some Conference Landmarks

Ivan A. Booker

Reasons for an Instructional Improvement Program

Many reasons are emerging for this new emphasis in the work of professional associations. Among the significant ones are these:

1. Activities to improve instruction represent a response to the genuine interests and needs of many association members. It would be a mistake to neglect an obvious responsibility of the organization.

2. Increasing demand for and experience with direct negotiation between teachers and school boards make it almost inevitable that some aspects of instructional improvement will appear in this context of study and decision making. Local teacher associations will introduce instructional change into the negotiations arena, and teachers must negotiate from knowledge and professional skill.

3. All members of the profession want and should have a voice in decision making about curriculum and instructional matters. The association provides an opportunity for them to speak, not from any hierarchical stance, but as members of the profession with collective authority and power.

4. An instructional improvement program has the potential for maximum involvement and participation of members—a wholesome thing for the organization.

5. The associations' very successful work in salary and welfare benefits must now be balanced by a parallel program on professional development and improved services in the classroom. Associations need to reduce their all too common image as self-seeking, welfare-oriented groups by increased emphasis on effective teaching.

6. Continued and increased public financial support of the school program is likely to be in proportion to public confidence in instructional improvement. Direct attention and effort toward this goal is a professional obligation.

7. Emergence of unprecedented problems, such as those of the inner-city schools, constitutes a new challenge.

8. The appearance of different patterns of education—new curricular structures, new media and materials, new teaching methods, and varied school organization—makes acceleration of change highly probable and professional concern about change imperative.

9. The potential for better education of children, youth, and adults makes inescapable the responsibility for direct action for instructional improvement. The professional satisfaction derived from successful teaching is yet to be realized.

A Favorable Climate

Among the conditions and circumstances, according to the conference reports, that make it appear "right" for an association to launch out in the area of curriculum change and among the methods and techniques of instructional improvement and personnel development, the following seem noteworthy:

1. There exists in the all-inclusive association the unique opportunity for professional educators to work together with no emphasis on their place in the hierarchy of the system. At least an overarch of

organizational structure and processes provides channels for communicating ideas and developing common goals and joint endeavors, without emphasizing separate bodies of administrators, subject area specialists, or classroom teachers.

In any event, the association which wishes either to make changes in curriculum and instruction or to prepare its members for changes which are imminent must plan specifically for operation in this area. If the association has never had a committee on instruction, a self-study, which can be requested from NEA Afiliates and Membership, may be helpful.

2. There should be at least a nucleus of dedicated professional leaders who have the vision, the organizational know-how, the courage, and the commitment to plan and launch a vital program. Regardless of the competence, brilliance, and other leadership qualities of the president of the association, he cannot be the instructional chairman during his administration. There should be a standing committee on instruction with members representing all segments of the association and serving for rotating three-year periods in order to make the plan for instructional improvement continuous. A member of the committee may be expected to serve as liaison with the negotiation team. Sometimes a committee on instruction can help maintain a healthy focus and the ability to work together on instruction, even during impasse over salary issues, if the channels are clear and a high trust level has existed.

3. Frequently the association itself is going through an important period of change—has just elected a slate of new officers or has done a self-evaluation and is ready for change or has just been granted official recognition by the school board.

4. Often the school system is in the throes of change from a new superintendent, a new board majority seeking change, or recommendations from a school survey.

5. In many cases there is widespread dissatisfaction among teachers with respect to instructional problems—materials, class groups, conditions that impede effective teaching, insufficient preparation for change.

6. A high percentage of the association membership is genuinely interested in quality teaching and willing to spend time and energy to do something about it.

7. A state, regional, or national agency has made resources available for instructional change. Such an opportunity can stimulate initial steps and make success more likely.

A Good Start

Once the decision is made to move into an instructional improvement program, how does the association start? Steps such as these seem to have been productive:

1. Establishment of an association arm or committee which can be assigned the responsibility for promoting the association interest in instructional improvement. Depending somewhat upon the need and the sense of readiness, this may be a standing committee, a sizeable council, or a task force. (The association executive committee might undertake this function initially, but the time required will soon call for a special group.)

2. Determination by association leaders of the general area of concern in which the association will operate to bring about change. (The initial program cannot cover everything. It usually focuses on one area, such as conditions of work that affect instruction, in-service education, or curriculum development.)

3. If the association is recognized as negotiating agent, early achievement of some kind of official status for the project in the negotiated agreement. (In any event, get administrative and board approval, when feasible.)

4. Careful preliminary planning by the leadership team: what is to be done; the sequence to be followed; the resources to be used.

5. A survey of the total membership to determine teacher interests, needs, and concerns within the area selected for the first attack.

6. Selection of specific tasks and development of planned activities consistent with the interests, needs, and concerns of the membership.

7. Dialogue with the superintendent and the members of his staff responsible for instruction about the problems and purposes of the association.

8. Development of the association's own program—one it planned and initiated itself. Participation in a program which originated outside the association and was brought to it with a request for collaboration is, of course, not precluded.

Danger Signals

An association's course may not run smoothly when it focuses on instructional improvement. Many types of barriers and blocks to progress are likely to be encountered, including the following:

1. Reluctance on the part of the administration and/or school board to have the association work officially on curriculum or instruction. (Tradition is against it. The administration may view it with fear or resentment, as an encroachment on its territory.) This roadblock—necessitating the acceptance

of the legitimacy of association work in this area—looms large and will for some time to come.

2. Similar reluctance on the part of curriculum directors, supervisors, and even many curriculum specialists in colleges and universities who see association work as an encroachment.

2. Teacher skepticism. Will the association's program be like so many of the staff projects in which they have taken part—largely busy work, getting nowhere? To counter skepticism, the association must establish credibility with its own members, proving to them that the association can and will do something about their instructional problems and concerns. Credibility with the school district authorities and the community is also an important goal.

4. Teacher apathy—"We're doing all right. Why bother?" Or, "It's a good idea, but let someone else do it." How to replace apathy and passivity with enthusiasm and commitment is a perennial problem.

5. Groups with vested interest in the status quo.

6. In some cases, legislation itself.

7. Lack of time. A serious problem is how to get adequate time for the work that needs to be done—time for the coordinating group, time for the task forces and research teams, and time to teach while participating!

8. Limitations of needed resources: finances, material, research data, personnel. The resources of the association itself may be too meager. Those available to it from outside may be too remote, too limited, or simply unknown. District resources may be too controlled.

9. Inadequate communication between the association leaders and members, between the association and administration, between the association and the public.

10. Waning interest. The enthusiasm for a new program may all too quickly die, making it difficult to continue the effective program.

Sources of Strength

Although the obstacles are many and serious, an association that moves into the improvement of educational processes can be sure of support of many kinds:

1. Once the legitimacy of its work is established, school authorities are likely to extend helpful, cooperative support.

2. A high percent of the staff usually will take interest in, and lend its support to, a sound program for instructional change.

3. Negotiation gives an association new leverage—new power—by formalizing agreements and providing grievance procedures.

4. The community will understand, appreciate, and support a program of demonstrated value in classroom work.

5. Students have proved themselves to be unexpectedly helpful with instructional programs that have teacher direction.

6. Full-time staff service—in a growing number of associations—adds a new dimension to what the association can do.

7. New legislation, such as professional practices acts, is opening new doors.

8. Successful pilot programs, in more and more associations, are converting dreams and theories into demonstrated realities.

9. New leadership is being developed in the institutions for teacher education.

10. Many state associations are building new service units and new programs designed especially to help their affiliated locals.

11. NEA resources can give leadership and help in many aspects of educational change.

12. The research units of state and national associations are able and ready to supply helpful data and assistance on many problems.

13. Through channels of communication maintained by the profession, there are regular reports on what is being done, where, and how.

14. State and national associations arrange many opportunities for leadership training in conferences, seminars, workshops, and the like.

It Might Just Work . . .

Just as there is no one best project for an association to undertake—because the program in each case should spring from local need—there can be no one best way for an association to proceed. The operating procedures, too, should take into account the local situation and the anticipated effect of each policy and plan. The organizational machinery, the practices, the relationships, and the sequence of events which led to success in one instance might prove futile or disastrous if transported to a different situation. Nevertheless, from the experiences of association pioneers, some observations about operating procedures may prove helpful:

1. Communicate with the membership frequently on all major decisions, listening as well as reporting.

2. Plan carefully and well before starting to act, basing the plan on the interests, problems, and concerns of the teacher members.

3. Get board of education approval through negotiation, where feasible, or through official board action. Issue your own publicity so that members know what the association is doing.

4. Move as fast as—but no faster than—the membership is prepared for. Where necessary, take time to build interest, create enthusiasm.

5. Create whatever type of central committee or council is needed for effective leadership, plus whatever supporting task forces are essential.

6. Engage in leadership training, if needed—conferences, seminars, etc. (In short, "beef up" the local association to the point where it can and will do effective work.)

7. Inventory all types of resources, especially the available expertise of the association's own members and the personnel resources which the community affords.

8. Arrange for some systematic, organized support for the program by a "prestige" group or groups in the community.

9. Arrange for involvement of individuals who do not represent power groups; for example, parents and children in all segments of the community.

10. Maintain the best possible cooperative arrangement with the administration, while retaining appropriate control of the association program.

11. Build and maintain good public relations in the community.

12. Use existing association groups as fully as possible; e.g., the TEPS committee, the negotiating team.

13. Utilize faculty representatives in discovering talent, making nominations, surveying needs, communicating with members, and evaluating results.

14. Plan activities that will involve the maximum percent of the association members. Their support for a program and their efforts to practice its recommendations are best assured by active and direct participation.

15. Evaluation should be built into the program from the beginning, not planned as an afterthought. Provide for face-to-face discussion and direct verbal feedback, as well as for questionnaire reactions and written reports. Have open hearings. Try brainstorming sessions from time to time.

16. Maintain normal association control over all special instructional committees, ensuring their accountability and thus their responsiveness to and communication with the association as a whole.

17. Through appropriate channels tap the resources of student opinion and cooperation.

18. Draw as fully as possible on help from other professional groups—the state association, NEA and its affiliates, institutions of higher education, regional laboratories and study centers, state departments of education, special subject matter organizations, the successful experiences of other associations working on similar projects.

19. Maintain the association's priorities. Be responsive if these change and so require a readjustment of schedule and timing.

20. If a negotiation "package" is developed by the association, there may be advantages to placing the instructional items first, ahead of salary and welfare proposals.

21. Once your study has shown instructional benefits to be valid, negotiate just as vigorously and courageously for them as for welfare proposals; they are for the eventual welfare of all in a mature profession.

22. Begin to build prestige in association work for the instructional leaders comparable to that heretofore given only to the salary chairman. In other words, begin to "move up" the instructional leaders who demonstrate real leadership by electing them to association office creating a vice-presidency for them or otherwise recognizing their accomplishments.

23. Attack a project small enough, and attainable enough, to assure some early success. "Nothing succeeds like success," or disheartens more than defeat or stalemate.

24. Use all available resources and help, but accept full responsibility for the outcome of your own program. No one can, or should, do the job that is yours.

25. Be a realistic but persistent optimist, knowing that some skirmishes will be lost but that progress can be made against apparently insurmountable obstacles.

26. Retain the clear distinction between association work in the area of instruction and staff work by teachers as school employees. Do not "drift" into old patterns. It is not enough to start an association program. It must be maintained until the identity is clear if members are to see their association as a viable agent for instructional improvement and to see instruction as a means of both improving educational opportunity and strengthening the profession.

27. In the matter of negotiation (although local circumstances are controlling), it is often important to establish the policies and machinery by which the teacher is given a direct and continuing role in instructional decision making and to spell out in detail the substantive items that represent agreed-upon decisions. (See the contract negotiated by the Lansing, Michigan, association, 1970, Part III.)

This section contains an abbreviated account of the successful projects of four associations and an analysis of their implications.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

The Scarsdale Experience

Focus

The purpose of this program is to improve instruction through an association-operated Teachers Institute—a series of in-service courses planned by and for the teachers. The courses, varying in length, carry no college credit and may or may not be approved by the board of education for salary credit purposes. Financial support comes from a lump sum appropriation from the board and the enrollment fees, $20 per course. About 250 of the district's 350 teachers have participated in the program, now nearing the end of its first academic year.

Why the Program

1. To provide teachers with continuing education, so that they are better able to deal with a rapidly changing and expanding world.
2. To demonstrate teacher interest in their own professional development as the basis of quality education.
3. To provide teachers with an avenue for self-directed activity.
4. To respond to the expressed needs of teachers in their own classroom situation.
5. To modify the image of the teachers association, regarded increasingly as an organization of radical militants.
6. To develop curriculum materials for system-wide use.
7. To provide teachers with learning experiences having a potential for transfer to the classroom.

How Launched

During the summer of 1968, three association leaders, including the Scarsdale Teachers Association president, envisioned such a program and developed the initial plan. Basic policies were included in the negotiation package and, with some reluctance, received board approval.

The executive board of the association created an Institute Committee—the three founders, plus one member from each of the district's seven schools. Course planning was begun on the first series—about half a dozen courses. Financial help was sought and obtained in matching amounts from NEA and the New York State Teachers Association to assure a "pilot" project. Then, the board appropriated $10,000 for instructors of Institute courses approved for salary credit. In 1969-70, the board appropriated the same amount for instructors and, in addition, agreed to pay the full salary of the Institute chairman (a teacher with half a teaching load who devotes the remainder of her time to administering the Institute).

Procedures

Control of the program is vested in the association's Institute Committee referred to above, responsible to the association through its executive board. In addition, there have been created: (a) an advisory committee of 14 prominent citizens which helps to refine course plans and (b) a supporting group of 40 citizens, "Friends of the Institute." Liaison is maintained with the Parent-Teacher Association and with student leaders.

The Institute Committee selects a competent teacher to plan and coordinate the work in each course. The planner may also be the instructor for some, or all, of the sessions. Specialists from the community, or from some minority, are brought in when needed. Staff members are paid $30 per hour for teaching. Others get more, or less; some donate their services. Classes are scheduled for maximum convenience of the participants, typically once a week for about two hours. About 12 courses per year are offered, 5 or 6 each semester.

The Institute may offer any course, whether or not the board approves it for salary credit. Conversely, the board reserves the right to offer any kind of in-service opportunity it wishes.

Problems and Solutions

1. Initial reluctance on the part of the board to include this project in negotiation. (A sound plan and evidence that the association could, and would, proceed, irrespective of board action proved helpful, as did strong support from community leaders.)

2. Financing, (NEA-NYSTA assistance with the pilot project, enrollment fees for courses, and eventually school board participation solved the financial problem.)

3. Teacher time—tremendous amounts are required. (The solution was found by involving everyone from the very beginning, continuously communicating, providing courses that do meet interests and needs, and making maximum use of teachers as planners and instructors. The half-time service of the Institute chairman is a helpful factor.)

4. Vested interests of the administration and board. (The association demonstrated competence and professionalism, utilized communication, and arranged for some direct participation of administrators, as consultants.)

5. Vested interests of colleges and universities in the area, accustomed to offering the only available in-service courses. (Here again communication was a factor, and specialists from these institutions have been used in the course work from time to time.)

6. Approval of courses for salary credit. (More and more courses are receiving approval, but some which the Institute Committee feels should be approved still have not been approved.) Note: The leader of a course—the planner and coordinator—receives no salary credit; however, if he serves as instructor, he is paid for his services.

7. Maximum participation. (Enrollment of 250 of 350 teachers is a good percentage, but the Committee's goal is total involvement, so frequent communications and opportunities to suggest are maintained. The nominal enrollment fee is regarded as a help in retrieving teacher interest.)

8. No models to follow—the plan seems unique, thus far.

Evidences of Success

The feedback from teachers at the coffee hours before classes, in the teachers' lounges, at association meetings, etc., seems to indicate changes in attitudes and considerable application of newly acquired information and skills. The association has a file of written reports submitted by some teachers on how they applied their course experiences. One group continued to meet and work on their own after the course was completed. The image of the association has improved in the community and with the board —negotiation on salary and welfare benefits is proceeding more smoothly. A favorable report on the program has been given by an outside agency from New York City. At the end of every course, each participant evaluates it. To be a course leader is becoming a "prestige factor."

DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING

The Racine Experience

Focus

Differentiated staffing was introduced in Racine prior to 1960, and the association has worked assiduously to ensure orderly progress and the introduction of a variety of school organizational patterns to meet the changing needs of the community. Solution of some problems has also been attempted through ingenious application of the negotiated staffing ratio which permitted the introduction of new kinds of professionals and paraprofessionals. At the same time, appropriate attention has been given to developing means to secure recognition of the additional tasks and responsibilities which have devolved upon many of its members.

Why the Program

1. To get the association in on the "ground floor" in decision making.

2. To meet the expressed need for definition or redefinition of job assignments, especially for staff with extra duty assignments.

3. To foster interest in staff utilization, stimulated by local participation in state and national programs.

4. To introduce experiments in various schools—team teaching, teacher aides, modular scheduling—with resulting uncertainties and problems.

5. To extend association participation in decisions on staff utilization within the contract.
6. To help solve growing problems in the inner-city schools.

How Launched

In the 1967 negotiated agreement, provision was made for a joint Job Description Committee of six: director of personnel, director of instruction, superintendent of schools, and three association representatives. (This committee was continued in the 1969 agreement.) The committee developed a format for job descriptions and made a beginning on its task in response to several requests. It must prepare a written job description of any extra-pay or extra-duty position if a request comes from either the association, administration, or school board.

Association representatives have been designated for several staff committees, such as those concerned with staffing ratio, teacher orientation, selection of tests and materials, duties of specialists, and teacher evaluation.

Procedures

The association's Conference Committee is its combination welfare committee and negotiating team. Its 37-page negotiated contract of June 1969 continues one year at a time through August 25, unless amended or replaced through negotiation. This is a key committee.

The Instruction Committee moved into a special study of the work of teacher aides by direct observations and time-task inventories. Nearly all of its recommendations have been adopted as association policy by the Delegate Assembly and now become matters for negotiation. Currently, it is exploring the optimum arrangement for bringing teacher aides into REA as members, perhaps in a special class, and the extent to which REA is to be responsible for negotiating in their behalf.

The association is officially represented on many important staff committees, such as those noted above and including those on the twelve-month school, long-range building planning, programs for inner-city teachers, career opportunities program, pupil records and reports, and various course of study development committees. The Building Delegate in each school serves on that school's Committee on Optimum School Facilities.

The Joint Committee on Job Description continues its work.

Increased study and attention is being focused on the special staffing and instructional requirements of the inner-city schools, explored extensively in a 1967-68 special project, "In-Service Program for Teachers New to the Inner City." The program originated less as a conventional in-service program than as a recruitment device to secure appropriately qualified and motivated teachers for inner-city schools. An association committee involved in the transfer of teachers to the inner city decided against arbitrary selection, made a survey of teachers already in the system, arranged for an in-service program underwritten with district funds to provide training and particularly to inform newcomers of the kinds of assistance they could secure and assure them of its availability. In addition, the committee obtained released time for six teachers to meet individually with likely candidates to discuss the prospects for a growth experience in the climate the association had helped to create. The program proved very successful, and the Racine reporters highly recommend this approach.

Problems and Progress

There were the usual problems of negotiation, financing, involvement, and communication.

Local leadership, paid staff, consultant, and other services from the state association and from NEA; generally good relationships between the local association and the administration and board; and large numbers of teachers willing and able to assume association responsibilities—all these have helped to move the program forward.

Evidences of Success

The number of association proposals that have been accepted in the negotiated contracts is one indication of success. Job descriptions are being produced and used. The recommended roles for professionals and paraprofessionals are influencing the decisions of staff and administration. (And incidentally, the faculty and principal of any school, subject only to the staffing ratio, are free to introduce team teaching, assign teacher aides, introduce modular scheduling, etc.) There is continuing interest in the problems of differentiated staffing.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Two Projects in Curriculum Planning: Delano and Palos Verdes (California)

Focus

Both projects are focused on the development of effective ongoing processes to bring about curriculum change. The chief responsibility is carried by the Curriculum Council, a broadly representative group in which the local association is strongly and officially represented. Subcommittees, task forces, and special committees carry out assigned tasks.

Why the Program

1. To improve the current curriculum.
2. To develop plans and models that can be used in an ongoing program.
3. To bring about greater teacher involvement in curriculum development.
4. To develop a legitimate, accepted role for the local association in the area of instruction.

How Launched

Initial contacts were between the superintendent of schools and a representative of the NEA Center for the Study of Instruction, followed by discussions between the superintendent and the president of the local association. CSI based its approval on an association and administrative climate favorable toward (a) representative participation in decision making, (b) curriculum change, and (c) investment of district funds in a pilot field study for curriculum improvement.

Procedures

Following discussions between superintendent and association officers, the plan was confirmed by CSI and approved by the association membership. Then, by mutual agreement (CSI-administration-association), the Curriculum Council was set up to develop policies and generally supervise the project. The 36-member Palos Verdes committee is representative—administrators, resource specialists for each school level, and one teacher representative from each school elected by his professional colleagues. Decisions as to what is to be done and how funds are to be expended are made by the Curriculum Council.

As a further example of procedure, the Curriculum Council in Palos Verdes established five special committees which have worked through the year. They were concerned with goals and objectives, articulation, communication, evaluation, and systematic curriculum development. The tasks of the first three are rather apparent from their names. The Evaluation Committee is concerned with a dual task: evaluation of educational programs and evaluation of pupil performance. The Curriculum Development Committee is at work on an acceptable "framework that identifies the numerous components of a curriculum enterprise and indicates the relationships of these components, plus how they can be made relevant, efficient, and meaningful." As a step in the development of a "model," the Committee produced a rationale for a systematic plan and applied it in the district's fall in-service workshop on reading instruction.

There is released time, in addition to committee work done on out-of-school time—evenings, weekends, and during vacation periods.

Problems and Solutions

1. The fact that the program originated outside the association and was brought to it with a request for participation, rather than being association-initiated. (Communication, involvement, and good results are helping to establish credibility and reduce skepticism.)
2. Almost all funds for the project are nonassociation funds supplied by the district. For example, in Palos Verdes, the association contributes $500; the board, $15,000. This affects the program and the image of the association's role. (Good relationships have diminished but not eliminated this problem.)
3. Maintaining the association's image as the important channel for teacher participation rather than participation as an employee of the school district. (Communication and interpretation are essential. Participation of state and national association personnel helps to strengthen the local association image.)
4. Not enough provision for face-to-face discussion and feedback from teachers other than those directly involved in the project. (Councils are working on plans to increase them.)

Evidences of Success

Preliminary evaluations and tentative conclusions are available. Association leaders believe that improved teaching has occurred in many instances. Teacher interest and involvement seems to be growing. In Palos Verdes, the association has negotiated on such matters as released time for project participants. There seems to be considerable evidence of change in faculty perceptions and interest with respect to "who should make what decisions" about curriculum and instruction.

NEW PERSPECTIVES IN COLLABORATION

The Indianapolis Experience

Focus

This program demonstrates a determined and continuous effort to transform an urban association from a dormant, status quo condition that had characterized it for a quarter of a century to a dynamic organization with the desire and the power to respond to staff interests and needs.

Why the Program

1. An accumulation of problems and needs building up almost to crisis proportions. Association survival was at stake.
2. A favorable climate for change—a new superintendent of schools, a new executive director for the urban association upon the retirement of its former executive director.
3. Encouragement from NEA and Indiana State Teachers Association.
4. Election of new association officers with the will and determination to revitalize the association.
5. Desire to have the association become a power in decision making, recognized as such by the school board and community.

How Launched

About three years ago, the association took part in a self-evaluation with NEA-ISTA collaboration. the Association took seriously the weaknesses revealed and set out to correct them. Needs and interests were identified through open hearings, brainstorming sessions, and questionnaires. An early emphasis was on strengthening the Building Representatives, so that they would become functional leaders and the Delegate Assembly a more vigorous and responsive body. An important step toward this objective was a leadership workshop, an overnight conference with some 120 participants.

Procedures

The association has worked through the usual channels, the staff and committees responding to the direction and supervision of the Executive Committee.

Standing committees have been held responsible for specific tasks and reasonable progress with them. The city's five-area organizational pattern has been reexamined and strengthened. Leadership training has been continued at intervals, including sensitivity training and group dynamics.

The association has engaged in many activities that are regarded as "par for the course" these days. It has been through an election to gain recognition; it has engaged in negotiation; it has "been to court a few times." It is now being asked to designate association representatives on the school system's important staff committees.

The association's headquarters office has been moved into the ISTA, with resulting mutual benefit. Two important new features have been introduced: effective collaboration of students and greatly broadened and intensified community relations.

The Student Committee, with 3 student representatives from each high school—about 30 students—and about 20 teachers, worked intensively on the problem of school discipline and developed recommendations that have influenced board policy.

The association has sought out and offered cooperation to all community organizations that would consider such collaboration, on the theory that "any one of them may be a friend on one issue and the main adversary on another."

Instructional problems and what the association should regard as its proper role in this area have just recently begun to come into the focus of association concern. The association hopes and expects to eventually become "the power center in instruction."

Problems

1. The long tradition of inactivity and resulting association image in the minds of teachers, administrators, school board, and community. (Communication, involvement, and demonstrated results are being used to change this image.)
2. School board/administration resistance. (Negotiation and pressure from strong community allies are reducing this resistance.)
3. Getting enough staff members to become actively involved and strongly committed. (Reorganization of the Assembly, improved two-way communication, and programs geared to staff needs are helping to establish the credibility of the program for change.)
4. Teacher apprehension about "power"—its possible misuse. (Interpretation and demonstration may eventually allay such fears.)
5. Need for outside help, professional and financial.
6. Lack of effective collaboration among the large urban associations in the state. (Plans are under way to develop a close relationship and effective teamwork among the state's urban associations.)

Evidences of Success

Strong indications of results are to be found in the following situations:

1. The increasing breakdown of communication barriers, first among the teacher groups themselves, then with the students, and more recently with community groups.
2. Student committee leadership of the discipline guidelines project.
3. The collaboration and acceptance by the board of education of association projects.
4. Participation in the coalition of Indiana urban associations.
5. Negotiated inclusion of an association representative on each district committee, including the Curriculum Committee.

INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT THROUGH NEGOTIATION

The Monterey Bay Experience

Focus

Instructional change and improvement through extensive negotiated agreements.

Why the Program

1. Combined local and state stimulus for large teacher participation in district instruction policy.
2. Existence of an accumulated patchwork in the district curriculum, which was not satisfying the needs of students or teachers.
3. Outgrowth of the work of an earlier educational policies committee, created in 1962-63.
4. Need to demonstrate that the association was interested in quality education, not salary and welfare benefits alone.
5. Favorable climate for increased association involvement following the 1965 passage of the Winton Act in California, which legislated the intent for teacher associations to be consulted on instructional policy.

How Launched

In 1965 the Monterey Bay Teachers Association decided that a professional association should do more than negotiate salaries. A retreat was held for the members, to which the school board and administration were also invited. The role of the association in curricular and instructional decisions was discussed. As a result, the district's curriculum committee was revised, and the classroom teachers committee of the MBTA was also enlarged and reorganized to assume a larger role in instructional change. (The classroom teachers committee on instruction has one member from each school in the district.) Coincidental to these changes, there also came into being a negotiating council of nine negotiators, one of them designated by and from the association's classroom teacher committee on instruction.

The association committee on instruction began with a study of teaching loads in elementary and junior high schools and induced the administration to employ some additional teachers at these levels. Other efforts were aimed at changing the courses for the retarded, then the gifted, then the educationally disadvantaged. These projects were only partially successful for, in retrospect, it was learned the hard way that the mere importation of outside curricula would not work. These first two years were quite frustrating.

In 1967 the association began submitting a comprehensive "package proposal" for negotiation which encompassed a large variety of teacher concerns for changing learning conditions and instruction offerings. Illustrative of these are the following: use of teacher aides; pupil reporting; classroom materials; ethnic balance; teacher involvement in the selection of supplies; full-time music, art, and PE teachers for the elementary grades; improved services from the materials center; provision for individual differences; released time for curriculum work; and textbook evaluation.

In terms of effective negotiation, considerable headway was made in 1967 and 1968. The district board accepted many proposals and implemented them as far as financially possible. Nonetheless, the association felt that there was not enough effective curricular change taking place.

At this juncture MBTA became aware of the NEA PD&IS search for local associations which were interested in a pilot venture to explore effective roles for local associations' activity in instruction and to examine local, state, and national relationships in this area. Several discussions among MBTA, NEA, state CTA, and CTA Central Section led to the granting of a collaborative pilot project in Monterey.

Procedures

1. The MBTA has relied heavily on its own local efforts with assistance from CTA consultants on survey instruments among the members in every school. These were used early in the spring of the year so that they could be tabulated and analyzed in advance of district budget development.

2. Survey results are duplicated and resubmitted to members to designate priorities. These priority lists are taken by the classroom teacher instruction committee and written into a package proposal which is approved by the MBTA and transmitted to the Negotiating Council. In the last three years instructional concerns have been at the head of the negotiation package.

3. Research is undertaken to gather the best possible documentation in support of the proposals. Local data are acquired, and state and national research agencies are drawn upon. Consultation assistance is also sought from state or national associations when needed.

4. The negotiation of the "package" follows the pattern recommended by the CTA and NEA. There is clarification of meaning, weekly feedback to members, proposals and counter proposals (item by item), until agreement is reached. Agreement on many items is almost immediate, leaving only a small number on which the real negotiation effort need be spent.

5. Designation as a PD&IS project association brought NEA and state staff to the district for a series of workshops. The initial one included a group of teachers, administrators, and board members. The group spent three days away from school, with the district supplying substitutes for staff and with the local CTA, CTA/CCS, and NEA sharing the expenses of the workshop. In this session the association's self-analysis led to a definition of the major problem: How could teachers find the time to design and help build a completely new educational machine while working full-time within the restrictive limits of the old one? They identified five areas of possible future work, but the most beneficial outcome was the process of reducing barriers and building person-to-person trust—a changing of attitudes.

6. The cadre of MBTA members which emerged from the first workshop planned a parallel experience for the total staff for two released-time in-service days, one elementary and one secondary, with a planning workshop for teachers on the following Saturday (teacher's own time). These have been held and are the springboard for the 1970-71 year. The next stage is to carry out an analysis of the forces for and against change in the district, a workshop which may be held this year.

Problems and Solutions

1. Acquiring sufficient support for proposed changes. There is no easy solution. The best available research information is employed, and efforts are made to enlist persons and organizations in the community—PTA, business leaders, press, etc.

2. Potential impasse. While most proposals offer no serious disagreement, an impasse can develop. In May 1969 there was an impasse over merit pay, which the board desired to install. This impasse was so intense that 75 percent of the staff remained away from school one Monday on a "frustration day." Others met their classes but donated their day's pay to the MVTA to support the association's position. The merit pay proposal was set aside. A feeling of cohesion among the members resulted, but a degree of resentment and suspicion was generated in other quarters.

3. Teacher-administrator and teacher-board of education relationships. The feelings of doubt and conflict have been greatly reduced by the activities in the NEA-CTA Pilot Project for the Improvement of Instruction.

4. Implementing the agreement items. The principal implementation problem is lack of money. The solution employed in recent years is to prepare more than one level of services and expenditures (alternate budgets) in the proposal package, to plan ahead in the event of budget cuts. The association accepts the responsibility of shared decision making on budget cuts.

Evidences of Success

The contracts negotiated have eliminated or reduced many of the teachers' concerns. The program has developed trust between administrators and teachers. It has given impetus to better communication. The association has been strengthened and given a better image. New horizons in association work have been opened to the members. The work has identified and brought forth potential leadership. General support for the program among the members is apparent.

As a part of the pilot project, the association has recently had the unprecedented privilege of utilizing for its purposes in-service days for more than 800 elementary and secondary teachers and administrators of the district.

JOINT COUNCIL

The Lansing Experience

Focus

The program in Lansing rests firmly on negotiated agreements, but features a Joint Council of teachers, administrators, and parents. The negotiated agreement deals primarily with the composition, duties, and procedures of this Joint Council and its related groups and only occasionally with specific

substantive items. The resulting work on curriculum and instructional problems is continuous and flexible with new items being introduced for consideration at any time during a school year.

Why the Program

The program was initiated through the vision and enthusiasm of a few association members, especially one president, at the time the association was ready to negotiate its first contract. They believed the Joint Council would do the following:

1. Give the association an effective voice.
2. Broaden the interests and concerns of the association to matters other than salary and welfare.
3. Provide for the active participation of all members in the educational decision-making process.

How Launched

The first master agreement negotiated contained one paragraph committing the association and administration to study what to do regarding curriculum in order to bring about staff involvement in curriculum and instructional development. The Joint Council of Teachers and Administrators resulted. Step by step, the project has evolved into its present form in which the Joint Council plays the essential leadership and coordination role.

Procedures

The Joint Council has 30 members. Its present structure and method of operation as well as that of its important adjunct, the steering committees, may be reviewed in the excerpt from the contract which concludes the Lansing report. Originally the Council included 12 teachers and 12 administrators. There were also 5 parents and 2 students on the Council who could not vote. As work proceeded, the interest and the knowledge of both parents and students were impressive. It was determined that the students work more effectively at the building input area, and they no longer serve regular terms on the committee although they are included at meetings where they are needed. The number of parent members has been increased to 6, and they now vote on all Council issues.

The Council was quickly accorded appropriate stature and has strongly influenced educational progress in Lansing. Proposals it approves and forwards to the superintendent are mandated to the board of education, and when confirmed, may be implemented. To date, although revision has been requested and changes have been made in some proposals, the board has never rejected a Joint Council proposal.

In addition to the steering committees, the Council has numerous very effective research and ad hoc committees. One, originally formed to study the problems of the gifted child, became the committee for the academic interest center and developed a three-year plan to open a facility to which students from all over the city come for accelerated work in courses almost of their own design. This committee then took under consideration the problems of a secondary building. When that project was completed, another committee went on to consideration of new elementary buildings. Thus, there is continuing, related, logical progress in Council activity.

Effort is cooperative. The "Pushout-Dropout" Committee works with the steering committees to determine the relevance of curriculum and with a volunteer teacher corps which tutors dropouts on their terms. For this project, the teachers did the planning, the administration developed the presentation, and a federal grant was awarded to implement the program.

With the number of activities in progress, it is clear that a high percentage of the staff is involved directly during each school year in the developmental projects, and every teacher has the opportunity to participate at least indirectly in the total process of change through the open channels for teacher suggestions and the city-wide meetings where proposals are evaluated.

Problems

Probably the chief problems have been time, pressure, and apathy—the problem of maintaining sufficient teacher interest to produce the necessary enthusiasm and commitment. More released time would be helpful since much of the work is done outside of school on a volunteer basis, even though there is released time for the monthly Joint Council meetings.

Evidences of Success

Over the years, the guidelines and rules of operation have been refined and improved. Some of the programs implemented are availability of more electives in the high schools, secured by the introduction of flexible scheduling; the phasing out of one junior high school; textbook selection with teacher

participation; guidelines for the duties of teacher aides and the functions of the master teacher in a nongraded elementary school; ungraded service and use of instructional media; participation in the assignment and transfer of staff; provision for teachers of two "visitation days" per year which, in the interest of solving specific problems, has sent Lansing teachers to widely separated areas of the country; and the overdue evaluation of so-called innovative programs which had continued to be innovative—in name —over a number of years.

Each steering committee is completing a two-year study of its field. There is an active committee on human relations. University relationships have been strengthened and better defined. A committee determines which requests for surveys or other participation in the preparation of theses will be granted, the university makes its resources available to the Council, and the schools collaborate with the university on teacher education, not only in a student teaching program, but also in an exchange program and a professional growth program which helps to fulfill one of the requirements for teacher advancement in the district.

Staggered terms on the various committees contributed to the association goal of total staff involvement in instructional improvement. The wide variety of activity allows the teachers to participate in community affairs, a further requirement for advancement.

EXCERPT FROM LANSING, MICHIGAN CONTRACT

Article XII
Curriculum

A. City-wide Curriculum Meetings

1. Each full-time teacher shall be required to attend two city-wide curriculum meetings per school year. All trade and industrial vocational instructors will attend two after-school advisory committee meetings as required by State contract in lieu of one city-wide curriculum meeting.
2. On the city-wide curriculum meeting days class schedules for the morning shall be determined by the Administration. Elementary Special Education classes will not be held and teachers shall use this time for parent-teacher conferences. Curriculum meetings shall begin at 1:30 p.m. and shall adjourn at 4:00 p.m. Class dismissal in all elementary schools shall be 11:30 a.m. and in all secondary schools shall be 12:00 noon. All teachers shall be dismissed at 12:00 noon.
3. Attendance at city-wide curriculum meetings is an obligation of the teacher's employment. Failure to attend, unless excused by the building administrators, shall cause loss of one-half day's pay.

B. Steering Committees

1. The steering committees should hold a minimum of three meetings per semester. Curriculum consultants will act as resource people and advisors in cooperation with the chairman. (Resource people would include consultants, directors, central administrative staff, principals, parents, students, audio-visual personnel, and others, determined by the curriculum committee.)
2. The LSEA Association Representatives will secure volunteers for curriculum steering committees during the first week of the fall semester. Each committee should have a broad representation from various grade levels and buildings.
3. Steering committees shall select their own teacher chairman in the spring to serve the following year.
4. Each steering committee shall be composed of 10 or more teacher volunteers and the coordinator of that particular area, if one exists. The curriculum consultants will act as resource people and advisors in cooperation with the chairman. In all K-12 curriculum areas it is the intent that the elementary and secondary committees will work together to achieve K-12 curriculum articulation.
5. The steering committees will present their recommendations for district-wide decisions in the Instructional Council. They will also conduct further research and study as recommended by the Instructional Council.
6. The system-wide, half-day curriculum sessions shall be held each year—one in November and the other in March.
7. The chairman and recorder for each of the various system-wide meetings shall be selected by a majority vote of the steering committee members. The recorder shall keep minutes of the meetings and forward a copy of these to the Director of Curriculum. The Director will forward such minutes to either the respective curriculum consultant or the secretary of the school of the recorder for typing and reproduction. Copies of the minutes will be provided for interested people as indicated on the distribution list provided by the Curriculum Office.

8. The functions of the system-wide curriculum sessions will be to:
   a. Discuss and take action on the recommendations of the respective steering committee.
   b. Hear reports of innovative programs in that area of the curriculum.
   c. Study ways to implement curriculum decisions.
   d. Review decisions of the Instructional Council.
9. The dates of the Lansing system-wide curriculum sessions shall be determined by the Director of Curriculum and either the President or Executive Director of the LSEA, in accordance with the provisions of these guidelines. Details of the individual meetings will be determined by the respective steering committees, in cooperation with the Director of Curriculum.

C. Instructional Council

1. An Instructional Council is established to act as a decision-making body for recommendations regarding curriculum and instructional development. The Instructional Council shall be composed of twelve administrators, twelve teachers and six parents, each of whom shall be a voting member. They shall be selected as follows:
   a. Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
      Director of Pupil Personnel
      Director of Curriculum
      Director of Secondary Education
      Director of Elementary Education
      Senior High School Principal
      Junior High School Principal
      Elementary School Principal
      Instructional Media Representative
      Consultant in Research and Educational Facility Planning
      Director of Continuing Education
      Director of Special Education
   b. The LSEA Board of Directors shall select twelve teachers, such teachers to be representative of:
      (1) The various curriculum areas
      (2) The elementary-secondary ratio
      (3) Groups such as the Helping Teachers, Counselors and Diagnosticians, and
      (4) The faculty and the LSEA at-large
   c. Parent Selection
      Six PTA representatives shall serve on a three-year rotating basis. The Lansing PTA Council will be asked to submit annually to the Superintendent a list of four nominees. The Superintendent and the LSEA President shall select two people from the four nominees.
2. The Instructional Council shall be chaired alternately by the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction and a teacher selected by the teacher representatives on the Council. The Chairman of the day shall retain his vote.
3. The Instructional Council will hear recommendations of the steering committees, discuss, approve, or ask for further study, clarification, or research of these recommendations. The Instructional Council may draw in any individuals with special qualifications pertaining to the area of curriculum involved, particularly the steering committee chairman and consultant for the curriculum area being discussed.
4. The Instructional Council shall meet monthly on school time (second Wednesday at 1:00 p.m.) and such other times as the Council may determine. If any member of the Council cannot attend a meeting, he shall make every effort to provide an appropriate substitute.
5. Comments by parents, or students, concerning curriculum shall be channeled to the Instructional Council by the staff member receiving them.
6. Proposals to be implemented the following September shall be approved by the Instructional Council by April 1. Extensions beyond April 1 may be made with the approval of 2/3 of the Council present and voting.
7. The Instructional Council shall have the authority to establish such additional steering committees as a majority of the Council shall deem necessary and desirable.
8. Teachers wishing to propose innovative programs in a given building may present such proposals to the appropriate steering committee for approval. The building principal will be notified of and consulted on such proposals. If the proposal is rejected by the steering committee, the teacher may submit it to the Instructional Council for its consideration.
9. Groups of teachers, or total faculties, working together with the building administrators in a given building, who wish to propose innovative programs that cross curricular lines involving more than one discipline or affecting the individual school program, may present such proposals directly to the Instructional Council for approval.
10. The Assistant Superintendent for Instruction shall receive recommendations from the Instruc-

tional Council and present them with his comments to the Superintendent.

11. The Superintendent shall arrange for presentation of the recommendations with his comments to the Board for prompt action.
12. The Board-approved program shall be implemented as soon as feasible.
13. Curriculum content recommendations which are rejected by the Board shall be returned to the Instructional Council for its reconsideration. The Council shall have the authority to modify the proposal and resubmit it to the Board through the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction and the Superintendent.

Pertinent questions from the participants and the analysts included: how to differentiate between negotiation of conditions of work related to instruction and negotiation of the methods and content; how to secure the right to negotiate instruction and how to determine the appropriate method once we have the right; when to negotiate process and when to negotiate specific items; whether associations should negotiate the kind of performance contracts being negotiated with school boards by the commercial information and instruction "industry." With the variety of issues "on the table" and the limited amount of time, however, no real consensus was reached about these controversial issues.

Many members of the conference viewed the solution of these problems as paramount in the immediate concerns of the local teacher role of agent for instructional change.

NOTES ON NEGOTIATION OF INSTRUCTION

Kenneth Law
Negotiation Specialist
NEA Field Services

The points raised above are sufficiently relevant to require attempts at resolution before we can be truly effective in an area which we all believe is crucial to our association development. Decisions about what is to be taught and, in some cases, how it is to be taught are being further and further removed from teachers. Through negotiations we are establishing our right to negotiate related areas such as pupil ratio, academic freedom, number of aides, etc., related to instruction but not directly related to curriculum. In order to deal with association involvement in curriculum, we must solve many problems, among which are the following:

1. Reaction against participation by our own members.
2. Roadblocks set up by school boards and school administrators.
3. Establishing our right to deal with these as negotiable items, once we have decided that we want to do so.
4. Educating our members to differentiate between their role as an employee and as an association member.
5. Eliminating a basic schizophrenia about our role as an association. It is most difficult to try and be all things to all people.
6. Dealing with other power groups like parents and students who we know also want a piece of the action.
7. Overcoming our role as part of the establishment with an accompanying inability to blow the whistle on some of the inappropriate practices of which we are aware.
8. Determining the most appropriate method of negotiation once we have achieved the right—in essence, what is appropriate wording of contract language, etc.
9. Developing full understanding of what negotiation really means, as opposed to discussion, paternalism, etc.
10. Effecting a marriage between the hard-nosed collective bargaining approach and a different negotiating model which might be better as we get more involved in curriculum.

There are several possibilities open to an association that becomes involved in negotiation of curriculum and instruction, no one best [illegible] depends upon not only the local circumstances, but what is to be negotiated. However, in general [illegible] that those items which relate to physical conditions under which instruction is to take place as [illegible] general guidelines needed for effective teaching should be negotiated directly and included in a contract in specific language. Most other items, such as what should be taught and how, might be determined by a less rigid form of negotiation; even here immediate exceptions come to mind.

The important thing is that no major decision affecting any of the related items will be made without the formal participation of the association—not just teachers as teachers. Following are some models which may be used in the process. Wording is not really indicative of good contract language, but the examples serve the purpose of [illegible]nstruction models.

1. Direct negotiation of the item: The contract may say something like: "Tenth-grade social studies courses offered will include World History and Asian Geography, both of which shall be elective courses."

2. Establishment of Joint Committees: "The Board and the Association agree to the formation of a Joint Instructional Committee to be composed of 4 representatives appointed by the Association and 4 by the Administration. The Committee shall be responsible for continuous study and review of curriculum content, textbooks, in-service education, etc. and shall report at least every two months to the Superintendent and the Board."

3. Establish Specific Joint Committees: "A Committee will be established no later than March 1, 1970, composed of 3 members appointed by the Association and 3 by the Board, for the express purpose of developing a policy proposal on school discipline. Said Committee will report to the Board and the Association no later than October 1, 1970, so that their recommendations may be included in negotiations for a 1971-72 contract between the parties."

4. Association participation on curriculum committees: "Existing curriculum committees or any subsequently established, shall each contain a minimum of 3 persons appointed by the Association."

5. Teacher representation: "All committees established to study any aspect of the education system, including but not limited to such items as curriculum, textbook selection, school construction, use of teacher aides and teaching supplies, shall be composed of at least 60 percent classroom teachers."

6. Prior Permission: "The parties agree that two in-service days per year for teachers will be the responsibility of the Association. Teachers will be released from school on said days and will be required to attend. The sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated by the Board for this purpose and will be made available to the Association upon completion of plans for the programs and submission of appropriate bills."

7. Recovering from the past: "The parties agree that recent introduction of modern math into the curriculum has caused undue educational demands on the staff. Therefore, all teachers who have taken, at their own expense, courses to train them for such teaching shall be reimbursed for the expenses of such courses. In addition, an in-service course in modern math will be offered to all teachers during the 1970-71 school year at the expense of the Board."

8. General Study: "The Board agrees to release the member of the Association Curriculum Committee from teaching duties 20 days during the 1970-71 school year. Said release shall be with full pay and shall be limited to 5 members. The purpose of such time is to allow the committee to research the total area of school curriculum and to develop proposals for consideration in negotiation of a successor contract. Said committee will file a written report with the Board and the Association no later than April 1, 1971."*

*The comments by Mr. Law were not written for publication but to provoke discussion. In view of the time limitation on this discussion, however, it seemed important to include them.

Lessons Learned

When a Foundation Goes to School

EDWARD J. MEADE, JR., *program officer in charge of public education, Ford Foundation.*

□ **There is almost no way that educational innovations** to improve learning in schools can succeed without the active participation of the instructional team. Those professionals who work directly with students must be in on the action at every phase of development for instructional projects to be on target. Further, these people must have time and assistance to train and retrain themselves if any new plans are to take root and grow.

This is one of the major findings of a recent Ford Foundation report, *A Foundation Goes to School*, that analyzes the results of the Foundation's $30-million effort to improve public schools during the decade of the 1960's. The report, prepared by a team of educators and not by Foundation staff, is remarkably candid in its discussion of the failures, especially those of strategy.

Clearly, any effort to improve schools has little chance for success without the active cooperation of the teacher. That is why the Ford program, called the Comprehensive School Improvement Program (CSIP), was largely a teacher development effort, in fact one of the most massive postwar teacher in-service activities on the national scene.

All told, 25 projects were supported by grants, ranging from $200,000 to $3.5 million, totaling slightly more than $30 million. The projects involved school systems in various parts of the country: in rural, suburban, and urban areas; small and large; rich and poor; obscure and well-known; segregated and desegregated; monolingual and bilingual; experimental and traditional. While no claim was made that collectively these projects sampled all types of American public school systems, they probably came close. Further, this program was mounted early in the 60's when any funding for innovations in schools was virtually unavailable from private or public sources. (ESEA and companion legislation were not on the scene until 1965.)

Collectively, the projects were intended to be "comprehensive," meaning that a variety of innovations were to be tried in such areas as curriculum, staffing, scheduling, technology, and organization. The reasoning was that a change in any one of these areas would necessarily affect the others and, therefore, the projects should consciously shape and take advantage of that chain reaction of change.

CSIP sought to encourage many of the following practices simultaneously: team teaching; the use of nonprofessional personnel in schools; flexible scheduling; variable size groups for instruction and new space arrangements; greater uses of audiovisual technology; programmed instruction; educational data processing by machine; independent study; nongraded school programs; new curriculum development; and school and university partnerships for curriculum improvement and for training teachers.

The Program operated on four key assumptions: (a) that the purpose of school is to promote learning, not teaching; (b) that learning is a continuous process related to a student's abilities and needs; (c) that content or curriculum represents a continuum and should not be frozen by grade levels or by the age of the pupil; and (d) that schools need constant and continuous examination of the ways in which they facilitate learning in order to take advantage of discoveries and knowledge about learning and human development. The fourth assumption was the key to the Program—to help school systems be receptive and accommodating to change.

What did the individual projects try to do? How did they go about doing it? What follows is a brief review of major educational objectives and the strategies tried to achieve them.

The objectives clustered in two areas: (a) organization and administration and (b) professional development and classroom practice. As teachers, we are primarily concerned here with the latter. The projects in this area employed five key strategies, each of which will be discussed separately: new patterns for utilizing instructional staff, development and use of new curriculum materials, use of technology, experiments in grouping students and use of time, and innovative arrangements and use of space.

Staff utilization. Modifying staff patterns in schools was intended not only to improve efficiency of the teaching-learning process, but also to break down the isolation of the self-contained classroom and to encourage professional interaction. Many approaches were tried, including the use of paraprofessionals to do noninstructional jobs and to assist in classrooms; the one-year assignment of teaching interns; the use of micro-teaching and recordings of teaching performance on videotape for later analysis; and the use of team teaching to build on the strengths of particular teachers and to allow for collaborative efforts to improve learning opportunities for students.

The overall results are hard to measure. While the use of paraprofessionals and teaching interns in schools is now firmly established and effective, the permanence and depth of such things as changes in teacher behavior and in classroom style or modification of teacher attitudes toward students and toward curriculum remain open to question. Still, the focus on a more productive use of staff provided a sig-

Reprinted from Today's Education • NEA Journal

nificant context for professional growth. For the most part, the teachers in CSIP were a cross section of those in education. The projects, however, created a climate that enabled average teachers to perform in extraordinary ways and genuinely influenced their professional work.

Curriculum materials. Each project dealt with the nature and structure of curriculum in a different way. Some used their energies implementing the "new" curriculums, such as those of the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) and of the School Mathematics Study Group (SMSG), ITA Reading, and Words in Color. Others worked on sequencing or repackaging existing curriculum for purposes of individualizing instruction. Still others developed new materials to meet specific needs—for example, materials on the emerging awareness of black identity or readers for isolated children in Alaska.

Interestingly, two major curriculum approaches dominated the educational scene during the early 1960's: programmed instruction designed to individualize instruction and the curriculum reform movement generated by scholars from academic disciplines. Each of these approaches had its following in various CSIP projects, and it is difficult to generalize on the basis of the success or failure of each. Still some outside materials for both approaches took hold, although almost all of them required extensive teacher training if they were to be used effectively.

Materials and curriculum that were developed by the projects were very popular and of greater variety. At the same time, both the Foundation and the projects underestimated the difficulties in producing new curriculum units. On the whole, in terms of both cost and the extent of student and teacher learning, the adoption of professionally developed curriculums produced more substantive change than in-house curriculum development, although the latter was an effective mechanism for in-service teacher training.

Use of technology. CSIP projects covered the gamut of instructional technology from the simple single technology, e.g., overhead projectors, to the complex, e.g., dial access systems for television film and sound tape. Still, CSIP made limited overall contributions in the uses of technology, so its findings are hardly adequate to measure the potential of instructional technology. Although many of the projects delved more deeply into technology than most schools do, the scarcity of appropriate programs or software limited the use of the hardware. As a result, the use of technology in the projects has fallen off markedly, and some equipment is gathering dust.

Further, where equipment was used to encourage new kinds of learning experiences, the quality of the software became central. Software must be related to clearly identified learning goals. Also teachers must be trained to use the machines and their messages and to integrate them meaningfully into the total classroom experience.

Grouping students and using time. Projects experimented with various student grouping and time arrangements, including large-group lectures, seminar-style small groups, independent study, extended days, special summer sessions, and modular scheduling by computers.

Flexible grouping proved popular initially but was used less and less as time went on, primarily because of lack of community understanding and because many teachers had difficulty dealing effectively with various forms and sizes of instructional group processes—for example, doing large-group demonstrations or leading small-group seminars. Unlike many of the other changes, scheduling innovations tended to affect virtually all staff members and therefore met with greater problems. Furthermore, community expectations and, in some instances, school regulations dictated that such practices be limited.

Use of space. Numerous efforts were made to rearrange learning spaces within traditional school buildings and to alter uses of conventional school facilities. CSIP projects took aim at the presumed relationship between silence, rigidity, and order, and their effect on learning and, as a result, moved toward more open space in the classroom.

Above all, however, CSIP demonstrated that physical facilities do not necessarily dictate the type of instructional program. Creative programs developed in the most traditional settings; and conventional ones, in modern facilities.

The report turned up what one might have expected, namely that these various strategies were closely interrelated and hardly separable. In fact, it is difficult to single out which strategy or innovation was accountable for which change in the quality of instruction or whatever.

So it is within a school. Each part and each person contributes, both positively and negatively, to the overall outcome of that school's program. But some do more so than others.

In the case of CSIP, innovation in staff utilization came closest to being the most permanent and most successful strategy. New curriculum and new technologies were less influential but lasting when coupled with systematic teacher preparation. The same held for changes in the use of time and student grouping. As students of any age were given more freedom to talk, to move, and to decide where, when, how, and what to study, parents, community members, and sometimes teachers became apprehensive that somehow academic learning was suffering.

In any event, CSIP did reveal the interlock that exists among all parts of a school and, to some degree, the role played by each part. Clearly, the teacher was and is central to a good part of the school's productivity, but clearly, too, he is by no means solely responsible. Many other factors—time, resources, policies, and the community with which that school must operate—are critical.

With that in mind, what lesson does *A Foundation Goes to School* teach us? Specifically, the Program

showed that:

1. Innovations took hold when they were limited and manageable in size and where objectives and techniques were few and sharply defined. However, the scope of limited innovation is just that—limited—and has little capability for broad-scale reform.

2. Large-scale change seems more likely to occur when all parties concerned have a clear-cut prior understanding of the specific purpose, nature, extent, and limitations of a proposed activity. Teachers, in particular, need to know exactly what is expected of them. Sweeping, generalized goals, such as "improving educational opportunity," often resulted merely in "more of the same" and made it difficult to measure the effectiveness of the activity.

3. Instructional personnel need to have opportunities to change themselves if they are expected to change educational programs. Such opportunities should include regular and systematic in-service training as an integral part of the job itself.

4. By and large, the size of the grant had little to do with the effectiveness of a project.

5. Of particular significance to teachers is the finding that the more local commitment in services and funds from the start the better. In part, this means working with the community every step of the way. Outside funds, at best, can be effective only for planning and initial testing of the ideas. Beyond that it takes local resources to sustain the change or the reform.

6. Small schools changed faster than larger ones, and a less complex system was easier to work with than a more complex one. The success of the small, less complex schools, seemed due, in part, to their reliance on fewer capable people. Obviously, this conclusion has relevance for those designing in-service training projects, teacher centers, and new schools.

7. The search must go on for more effective kinds of educational decision making. These projects used various governance arrangements, and none seemed better than any other. Policy making for educational change is difficult for many educators and laymen alike.

8. A critical factor in the success of a project was the commitment and continuity of leadership and key staff. The projects that seemed most effective, both during and after grants, were those in which directors and/or other key staff had served in their planning, development, implementation, evaluation, and adoption. In education, as with any human service, change is difficult and cannot be accomplished realistically in a short time, especially when there are frequent changes in leadership.

9. Colleges and universities as institutions were seldom effective forces for improving schools. Some university people as individuals were extremely effective, but higher education institutions were not viewed by any party (including the institutions themselves) as serving the schools well. School and college partners seemed to have little understanding of the roles each needs to play to be most effective.

And yet, the opportunity is clear. A key factor in improving schools is improving the instructional staff. It would seem that school systems and the communities in which they are located, teacher organizations, and colleges and universities ought to be able to find ways to build relevant, solid in-service training programs for these key people.

10. Projects which were large enough to require the cooperation of a number of community forces but small enough not to become a political football between powerful interest groups seemed to be most successful.

11. Projects were more likely to waste funds if their communities were in the throes of controversy at the time of the grant. Conversely, projects which started after the resolution of conflict seemed to make better use of funds. In other words, new programs have a better chance of survival if launched after, rather than during, conflict situations.

12. All the interested parties (pupils, parents, public, and professionals) need to be brought into the life of the project—if not to participate directly (and many should), at least to understand what it's all about. They need to know that complex problems have no simple answers and that education is far from simple. Obviously, improving schools is a matter for many and not just a few, and, certainly, it is a process that should be improving constantly as our knowledge about human development and learning expands.

A Foundation Goes to School is a part of that process. From it we have learned not to give up on schools, which many are inclined to do, and not to berate those who serve in them, which is a popular but unproductive activity. Rather, we have learned that the matter of improving schools is more difficult than many assumed it would be. More importantly, we have learned that we have much work to do and that, thanks to the findings of this report, we know better how to do that work.

Indeed, this report offers testimony to an insightful comment made some years ago by Ole Sand of the National Education Association that we can learn as much, and perhaps more, from educational pathology that includes failure than we can from the usual practice of describing only successes. Knowing what did work or did not work is not enough. As teachers and educators, we need to know why. *A Foundation Goes to School* can help with some answers. □

◆ *Copies of* A Foundation Goes to School *are available from the Office of Reports, Ford Foundation, 320 E. 43rd St., New York 10017.*

Paul S. Pilcher

TEACHER CENTERS: CAN THEY WORK HERE?

A warning that successful transplantation of the teacher center idea to America may involve a redistribution of power along British lines

Reprinted from the January, 1973 issue of the PHI DELTA KAPPAN
Copyright January, 1973 by Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.

This year for the first time I have been an educational consultant. For me this has been a totally new role to play, and I started out full of enthusiasm, eager to share the new ideas and experiences I had gained in study and in visiting a wide variety of schools. Six months later, however, I find myself filled with a vaguely disquieting sense of frustration over my lack of effectiveness, and more generally over the viability of outside consultants in promoting lasting change in schools.

In recent discussions I have been surprised to find a large number of university people who feel similarly about consultant roles; I have even talked to one highly successful (in monetary terms) professor who has foregone consulting altogether so that he could "live with his conscience." In many cases, consulting seems little more than a cruel hoax perpetrated upon teachers, children, and parents by the educational establishment: raising their hopes, taking their money at $100 per day or better, and after 3 or 6 or 12 months departing for the friendly confines of academia, leaving schools and teachers largely unchanged. The very idea of "instant experts" being able to "fix it" in a few hours a week seems a purely American fantasy. It seems particularly absurd to those of us who believe that the most crucial changes must come in the attitudes of teachers toward children, and that meaningful methodological changes will be the result primarily of teachers working positively and openly with children over a long period of time.

PAUL S. PILCHER (Harvard University Chapter) is an Ed.D. candidate at the University of Massachusetts, where he is a consultant and lecturer on open classrooms and has served as director of the Reading/Study Skills program.

In this context of disillusionment with present inservice experiences, I began to read and hear about teacher centers. The idea was exciting, not just because it was different, but because it seemed to be based on some basic truths:

1. Fundamental educational reform will come only through those charged with the basic educational responsibility, to wit, the teachers.

2. Teachers are unlikely to change their ways simply because imperious theoretical reformers tell them to shape up.

3. Teachers will take reform seriously only when they are responsible for defining their own educational problems, delineating their own needs, and receiving help on their own terms and turf.*

As Stephen Bailey described it in the *Kappan,* the model of the British teacher center seemed almost too good to be true:

> Teacher centers are just what the term implies: local physical facilities and self-improvement programs organized and run by the teachers themselves for purposes of upgrading educational performance. Their primary function is to make possible a review of existing curricula and other educational practices by groups of teachers and to encourage teacher attempts to bring about changes.

At last it seemed we had hit upon a viable inservice model which could meet the very real desires of classroom teachers for assistance and improvement without necessarily subjecting them to the hastily formed judgments and prescriptions of outside experts who came, looked, told, and left. Assistance from universities and other sources of expertise would come only if and when teachers wanted and requested it. As a corollary, teachers would hopefully feel free to use only that advice and assistance with which they felt comfortable, and which fit their specific situation.

As a model, the teacher center seems to answer most of the doubts and problems I believe surround present inservice programs. Teacher growth would be self-initiated, insofar as possible self-directed, and it would be continuous. The question then becomes one of translating the idea into reality in American public schools. This process is where I believe we are on the verge of making some potentially disastrous mistakes.

The Bandwagon Effect

Just because we speak the same language, Americans seem prone to the misconception that British institutions will work here. This has been true of the British infant school reforms, at times with tragic consequences. It seems no less true of teacher centers. Amidst all the ballyhoo and enthusiasm over the idea of American teacher centers, it is important to take a hard look at some of the issues posed by their creation. The issues involved are not merely ones of "improved education" (whatever that means), although the debate may be carried on in those terms. To the extent that teacher centers make a statement about who controls what goes on in schools, the issues are political. To the extent that establishing teacher centers involves a redistribution of that power, the issues become those of political change and of strategies for achieving that change.

One of the most important features of British teacher centers is their home-

*Stephen K. Bailey, "Teachers' Centers: A British First," *Phi Delta Kappan,* November, 1971, pp. 146-49.

grown, indigenous nature, arising from the needs and interests of specific districts. National coordination and planning has tended to be supplementary and largely after the fact. Teacher centers are thus the product of and compatible with the particular set of power relationships extant in British state schools. How do such power relationships differ from those found in American public schools? What are the consequent implications for American teacher centers? These questions have gone largely unexamined in the current rush to jump on the teacher center bandwagon.

In place of such an examination, one finds a disquietingly naive acceptance of the idea by many American educators. On the campuses of such leading innovators as the Harvard and University of Massachusetts Schools of Education, there is a sudden rush to form groups to plan and implement teacher centers. Fifteen-thousand-dollar planning grants for 20 teacher center sites have suddenly materialized from the U.S. Office of Education. Three state departments of education have received federal funding of $250,000 each to set up teacher centers. Houston, Texas, projects are receiving USOE funds in the million-dollar category for teacher training programs, including teacher centers. Amazingly, within 6 to 8 months of the appearance of Bailey's article, some 75-100 teacher centers were reportedly *in operation* in the United States. Such breathless and unquestioning action seems wasteful and moreover dangerous to the survival of the teacher center concept, for reformers in such a hurry obviously cannot take time to consider the thorny and multifaceted problems of power redistribution implied by the British model. The prospects for American teacher centers having a significant impact on American schools will remain gloomy, however, unless we can deal satisfactorily with such questions of power.

At least three sets of power relationships seem to be involved in the establishment of teacher centers: 1) the relationship of teachers with university and other outside, 'R & D -type' experts; 2) the relationship of teachers with the school administrators; and 3) the relationship of teachers with the local community.

Teachers and Outside Experts

The American public school teacher has for years been the "nigger" of the system. Nowhere is this more obvious than in his relationship with university and other outside experts. Deferentially, he scrapes and bows, listening politely and following obediently the dictates of the obviously superior minds of the outsiders. Just as predictably, when the outside expert leaves, the teacher typically reverts to his old ways. If necessary, he may continue to follow the form of the expert's prescription without its underlying rationale. Indeed, American teachers have proven quite ingenious at sabotaging the carefully laid plans of the most eminent university minds. (Remember the teacher-proof curriculum?) One would think the outsiders would have caught on by now. Instead, like the plantation owners of the previous century, the R & D people return to their "big houses" to sit and scratch their heads in wonderment: "Why the hell haven't these workers in the field improved when, after all, we've shown them how to do it!" Disgusted heads shake amidst comments about the general incompetence and intransigence of American teachers.

"The American public school teacher has for years been the 'nigger' of the system. Nowhere is this more obvious than in his relationship with university and other outside experts. . . . [But] American teachers have proven quite ingenious at sabotaging the carefully laid plans of the most eminent university minds. (Remember the teacher-proof curriculum?)"

Admittedly, this generalized picture of total failure is an exaggeration for many cases. What is vitally important and no exaggeration, however, is the master/servant, superior/subordinate role relationships of curriculum developers, consultants, et al. to the classroom teacher.

The set of relationships between British universities, curriculum theorists and developers, and classroom teachers stands in stark contrast. British teachers seem to look upon these outside agencies as resources or, in certain instances, as partners. The key word is *partner*; teacher and curriculum developer are equals, professional colleagues engaged in different aspects of the same enterprise. As far as particular children are concerned, the classroom teacher is regarded as the "expert." Decisions as to what is appropriate for a class of children rest with the teacher and the principal.

If all this seems so eminently logical and obvious as to be hardly worth comment, we should note that this is *not* the usual pattern in American public schools. I have found myself in the position of being expected to know more about a classroom from a couple of one-hour consultation visits than the teacher who has been working full time for several months. On one occasion I was asked to prescribe curriculum remedies before I had even visited the class! Such unfortunate examples are more frequent than we might like to believe. On the other hand, in England there have been reports of university professors going to teachers for advice and actually visiting classrooms to learn from the practitioners. In the schools of education which dominate our educational hierarchy, such a thought is barely conceivable.

This whole set of relationships might be somewhat irrelevant if universities and consultant agencies were not directly involved in the creation and running of teacher centers. If, for example, the USOE followed simple logic and granted funds to groups of classroom teachers for the purpose of establishing self-renewal and inservice centers, the rules of the game would change dramatically. Teachers would then be free to hire (and fire) outside personnel on the basis that they (the teachers) wanted. In the Alice-in-Wonderland world of government, however, precisely the opposite is happening. One looks at the list of participants in a government-sponsored teacher center conference and there is an overwhelming preponderance of university and "curriculum expert" personnel. The few representatives of school districts turn out to be primarily curriculum supervisors, resource people, etc. One searches in vain for a few genuine classroom teachers.

The funding process to date has followed a similar pattern. The primary agents for setting up teacher centers are – who else? – university groups and educational laboratories or consulting

agencies. To be sure, a major part of their mandate is to facilitate the wishes and desires of teachers. Predictably, teachers are skeptical about this idea, and rightly so. They perceive that the real power relationship remains unchanged; in the final analysis it is the outsiders who retain control over money and policy. In an effort to overcome this suspicion, some "facilitators" have even gone so far as to say the university has no vested interest in the project, and that teachers are free to make *all* the decisions. Here again we run into a stumbling block. If someone has power and tells me he is giving it to me because he has no vested interest, I am forced to one of two likely conclusions: 1) He is lying and will only refrain from interfering as long as I do what he wants me to, or 2) he is telling the truth; he really doesn't have a "vested interest," which is to say he has no real interest at all, which in turn says he has no real commitment to the project's eventual success. In either case, I doubt if I would be anxious to jump headlong into the project. Even if a particular group of facilitators were both sincere and committed to the project, it seems unlikely that teachers can depend on the universities' altruistic motives to sustain that commitment if and when personnel change and the going gets rough.

The USOE has predetermined that outside experts will maintain the power not only by conferencing and funding patterns, but also by the set of criteria it has erected for teacher center formation and evaluation. Accountability is Washington's latest discovery. As a result, the USOE has insisted upon a set of academically rigorous performance criteria for teacher centers, necessitating a certain amount of research expertise not possessed by most teachers. Classroom teachers are thus effectively barred from meaningful participation in a variety of ways. One might well ask what happened to the original idea of a local site set up by teachers to meet their particular needs as working professionals.

Clearly what is happening is that, wittingly or not, the USOE is allowing a basically sound idea to be co-opted by the educational establishment of university professors, educational consultants, and curriculum developers, who are at least several steps removed from the classroom. This group has proven notably unsuccessful in effecting change in American public schools despite the millions of dollars spent yearly for their services. While such a development is hardly surprising in view of the enormous power and influence of these groups, it is still disheartening.

The Teacher and Political Pitfalls

Even if a group of teachers and outside consultants were somehow able to overcome the difficulties inherent in their relationship, there are other related pitfalls that stand in the way of teacher centers. These have to do primarily with the intertwining relationships of the local community and school administration with classroom teachers.

There is no history of professional autonomy for teachers in the United States. Our schools have been publicly created, publicly owned, and publicly directed. Since the days of the one-room frontier schoolhouse, Americans seem to have operated on the assumption that since they created the school and hired the teachers, they had the right to determine what went on in the classroom. This led to a system of local financing and control of schools, which in theory makes education responsive to the public's will.

What has happened, however, is that since schooling is universal, local financing and control have put schools in the impossible position of trying to please everyone. Schools have become highly susceptible to the pressure tactics of organized special interests.

One consequence of this search for consensus has been the tendency to reduce the content of public education to the society's lowest common denominator, with the resulting brand of curricular pablum that avoids anything human, emotional, controversial, or in fact even interesting. Another consequence has been to blunt the initiative of the classroom teacher. American teachers are understandably reluctant to strike out into uncharted waters when they are well aware that any "mistake" which antagonizes parents may cost them their job. Even in cases where job security is protected by tenure the teacher is not freed from the fear of community reaction. He is aware of the curriculum innovations that have been banned and the budget fights that have been lost over the issues of teacher "permissiveness," social radicalism, and other unpopular-sounding causes.

If the teacher is not fully aware of the political dangers involved in moving in innovative directions, the school administrators are. Like any established institution which must fight political battles for public money, the school system takes steps to ensure its own survival. This requires a supervisory and evaluative bureaucracy to see to it that the rank and file (that is, the teachers) do nothing to jeopardize the system's political advantage. Thus we see the creation of the generally oppressive system of monitoring and checking teacher behavior to make sure that teachers do not stray from the prescribed curriculum: that they do not, in short, rock the political boat.

Such generalizations do not, of

"I don't think I'll ever be able to adjust to this youth-oriented culture."

course, apply with equal force to all school districts. What does seem to be almost universally true, however, is the rigidly hierarchical superior/subordinate, master/slave relationship between administrator and teacher. This encourages, even demands, a role of passive obedience from the teacher and, incidentally, drives many of the best people out of public school teaching. In such a context, it is hard to imagine a teacher center flourishing – at least not without some major political battles being fought and won.

British education has followed a different path. Two interrelated elements seem to be of primary importance: traditional attitudes toward education and teachers, and the source of financing for the schools.

Chief education officers in Britain do not have to wage a constant battle over tax support for schools based on local issues. Funding for local schools comes from the national government; this process serves to insulate schools from local power struggles and free education officials to attend to the task of education for children. A concomitant result is that positions in British schools tend to be created primarily for educational, not political, reasons. Thus the head teacher really teaches, the chief education officer really is an official who deals primarily with children and learning, and so forth. The British apparently see no need for as rigid a hierarchy of supervisors, checkers, and evaluators as Americans do.

Such relationships can be traced to an attitude of trust which seems to pervade British education. Local education authorities seem reticent to interfere in the internal affairs of a school. They seem to feel that these are best left to the professional educators on the scene. Similarly, many British head teachers, involved as they are in the daily business of actually working with children, grant far greater autonomy to classroom teachers than would be deemed "wise" in most American schools. British parents, too, seem far more reticent to criticize school officials, on the premise that they know what they're doing, although there is some evidence that this may be changing.

The cause-and-effect relationship of these various factors is open to interpretation. What seems indisputable, however, is the net effect. British teachers are often given great latitude in determining what they will teach and how they will teach it. The result is a teaching profession more in control of classroom practices and more likely to strike out in new directions than its American counterpart.

Evolutionary Promise

Clearly we are operating in a significantly different political context than Britain when we speak of reform in American public schools. Even from this brief analysis, certain implications for American teacher centers seem obvious. To establish effective teacher centers will require either the abdication of power by those who now hold it or a process of political in-fighting and compromise by those who don't. If the first alternative seems highly unlikely, then we who would have teacher centers must prepare ourselves for the second. This may well necessitate a "go-slow" policy of small changes over a period of years. Certainly it will require more careful examination of the power relationships involved than has been made to date. American educators will probably also have to involve the community on an equal basis in the planning and implementation of teacher center projects.

The picture is not entirely bleak. There will doubtless be districts where teachers and outside personnel will find a way to work together congenially and will find support from an understanding administration and an enlightened citizenry. Such will be the exception rather than the rule, however. A more likely prognosis is that most teacher centers will die on the vine. Many of those that do survive will doubtless be stunted by the domination of school administrators, university consultants, or both.

We should not let this happen, because the teacher center idea is still a basically sound one. If put into practice in this country, it would mark an important step in the evolution of public education toward a more enlightened and more rational system of schooling. Good ideas in education are rare, and it would be a shame to let this one go down without a real chance. That, however, is precisely what will happen unless we take note of the political dimensions of educational change and act accordingly. □

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Briefing MEMO ipod
INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY, 1973 • NO. 2

OPEN SCHOOLS AND THE TEACHER

The idea of open schools, like open marriages, open sandwiches, and open shops, will mean something different to each of us depending on our past experiences, our expectations, our purposes, and the degree of openness we can tolerate in a given situation.

Today many varieties of open education are to be found in the land. Yet a certain amount of confusion over terminology and practice clouds the meaning and limits wider adoption by schools of the best practices within this growing movement. One way to begin an examination of this idea is to consider some of the meanings of that wonderfully liberating English word open:

> *To make more responsive or understanding; susceptible, inviting; willing to hear and consider or to accept and deal with; characterized by ready accessibility and cooperative attitude; candid, characterized by a lack of pretense; presenting no obstacle to passage or view; free of prejudice; to remove obstructions from; receptive to new ideas and arguments:* an open mind.

Combining the concepts of "openness" and "schooling" is an idea that some consider a contradiction in terms. Others see it as an idea whose time has come--a long overdue approach to a really humane, individualized kind of learning. Since the essence of this idea is based on its flexibility, many of its practices are difficult to describe.

The concept of open schools comes primarily from the British infant schools (pupils aged 5-8). The work of A. S. Neill, one of the early pioneers in this movement at Summerhill, is almost as well known in this country as it is in England. The idea received its first popular introduction to the U.S. through the writing of Joseph Featherstone and later gained strong support from Charles E. Silberman who urged its acceptance and lauded the efforts of North Dakota in this direction. The NEA, through its Schools for the 70's and other programs, has helped teachers become familiar with the ideas emanating from this movement.

Although the open school idea originated in early childhood education and the terminology has been applied almost exclusively to the elementary level, many secondary and continuing education programs are now adopting flexible scheduling, minicourses, and other innovative approaches designed to open up the school to the rich resources of the surrounding environment. The open university, which also had its origin in England, is perhaps one of the most exciting educational phenomena of recent times.

A necessary consequence of openness in the school is the abandonment of rigidly prescribed curricular programs. A basic component is the ability of the teacher to create a rich learning environment with a variety of resources appropriate to the continually evolving interests and capacities of individual children. The focus is on making provisions for and guiding learning rather than prescribing and directing it. This, of course, implies the necessity of the teacher's being able to make continuing diagnostic decisions about students and learning events. It presupposes an atmosphere of warmth, encouragement, and respect for each person.

Predictably, open schools have generated bitter political battles. Proponents have stressed the humane, individualistic concerns; opponents, the lack of emphasis on what they perceive to be basic skills and traditional discipline. These discussions often have little to do with the central idea of opening up the learning environment.

Various and sundry names have been given to the open school. The term has also been used to describe the architectural and physical characteristics of school buildings, but since many such open settings continue in the tradition of the self-contained classroom, this narrow physical definition often has little or no application to the instructional program.

Value to Students and Teachers

Although open schools have not been in existence long enough to permit long-range studies of their effectiveness, research conducted to date suggests that student achievement as measured by standardized tests is comparable to that attained through more traditional approaches. Many have observed that student goals are enlarged in an open setting; observational and experiential accounts overwhelmingly attest to the dramatic increase of motivation, enthusiasm, and independence among students and teachers. Parents who have been actively involved often share these feelings.

Obviously the shift from the traditional to the open classroom is very demanding for any teacher, and some very effective teachers may find it difficult, if not impossible. But to those who are interested in this technique and are working in a potentially sympathetic situation, the open school approach appears to offer new vistas for professional creativity, expression, and reward.

Some Constraints

Open classrooms are most emphatically not finished products that can be transplanted from one situation to another. Nor can they be unilaterally imposed upon a teaching staff; there is no faculty now in existence that can be expected to function in open classrooms without some preparation and guidance in this mode of teaching. The most essential element of open classrooms is the "open" behavior of the teacher, which will come voluntarily or not at all. And it must be genuine.

Just as important at the outset are informed, involved, and supportive parents. A school district with a suspicious and polarized community would be ill advised to create open schools without first working to obtain strong parental support.

There are, of course, a variety of ways in which every teacher can strive to make his classroom more joyful, humane, and creative. The literature now available on open schools provides valuable cues, insights, and suggestions.

Recommendations to Local Affiliates

1. We strongly urge that the Association support, and if necessary defend, the efforts of any teacher attempting to incorporate open school behaviors and activities in his classroom, provided that they fall within the limits of adopted school policy.

2. We urge that any school policy restricting such professional behavior be modified to allow it.

3. Minimal conditions for the adoption of such a program by a school faculty would include:

   a. staff determination of program desirability

   b. voluntary participation of all staff

   c. provision of in-service education programs sufficient to satisfy staff needs as judged by the staff

   d. existence of potential community support and staff commitment to develop it

   e. assurance of administrative commitment to provide all necessary resources as identified by the staff

   f. provision for evaluation or revision, or even abandonment, of the project without penalty or loss of prestige.

For More Information on Open Schools

Barth, Roland S., and Rathbone, Charles H. A Bibliography of Open Education. Newton, Mass.: Education Development Center, 1971. Unpaged. $1.25. Includes several hundred references, plus 22 motion pictures.

Bremer, Anne, and Bremmer, John. Open Education, A Beginning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. 183 pp. $5.95. The authors encourage teachers to abandon their conventional roles at a time when society is forcing role change for students, parents, and others. " . . . the way to teach is to avoid being a teacher."

Clegg, Sir Alec. Revolution in the British Primary Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1971. 48 pp. $2.50. Written by a leader of the quiet revolution that has transformed British primary education since 1945, this booklet suggests how American teachers can profit from the British experience. Foreword by Charles E. Silberman.

Frazier, Alexander. Open Schools for Children. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972. 86 pp. $3.75. "Openness," says Frazier, "is the most powerful and germinal idea on the education scene today." This work examines what is happening to the open concept in the education of children.

National School Public Relations Association. Informal Education: 'Open Classroom' Provides Change, Controversy. Arlington, Va.: the Association, 1972. 60 pp. $4.00.

Neill, A.S. "Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!" New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972. 538 pp. $4.00. "Obedience implies fear, and that should be the last emotion encouraged in a school . . . I have come to believe that the greatest reform required in our schools is the abolition of that chasm between young and old which perpetuates paternalism," says the 80-year-old Neill in this lively autobiography. Expounding his radical ideas about education, sex, politics, and psychology, Neill looks to the future of Summerhill, the school he founded 50 years ago.

Rathbone, Charles H. "Examining the Open Education Classroom." School Review 80: 521-49; August 1972. This comprehensive paper describes organization of space, time, children, instruction, and takes a critical approach to such matters as definition, appropriateness, and evaluation. The author, who is director of the New City School in St. Louis, supplements this piece with a useful bibliography.

An Annotated Bibliography on Open Schools. 1973. Available without charge from IPD/NEA. (See box below.)

This *Briefing Memo* is a response to requests from members for information on the above topic. It has been prepared by the Instruction and Professional Development staff of the National Education Association as a brief but accurate introduction to this topic for busy teachers and as a resource for readers who wish to pursue the subject in more detail. Except where indicated, the views expressed here do not represent official Association policy. This document has not been copyrighted and permission is granted herewith to members of the United Teaching Profession who may reproduce it in full or in part for non-commercial use provided credit is given to the NEA.

For information on other *Briefing Memo* topics, write or call the Information Center, Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Phone: (202) 833-4337.

Part VIII

Bibliography

Books

The books listed below were selected as reference for local associations interested in a broad look at the theory and nature of educational change.

1. Beck, Carlton E., and others. *Education for Relevance*. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968. 260 pp.

   The position this book takes is both useful and sound for those who see a need to change patterns in education: since society does not stand still, an educational system that exists to promote values of the past becomes irrelevant. It moves farther and farther from the lives of students. Contains a social-historical perspective and relates it to changes in education.

2. Bennis, Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; and Chin, Robert, editors. *The Planning of Change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., Second Edition. 1969. 627 pp.

   This volume deals with change in the affective domain, is theoretical and academically oriented. " . . . reflects the current rapid expansion and the development of theory building, research, and practical experimentation in applied behavioral science."

3. Goulet, Richard R., editor. *Educational Change: The Reality and the Promise*. New York: Citation Press, 1968. 285 pp.

   A report on the National Seminars on Innovation, 1967. The purpose of the seminar was to communicate an assessment of endeavors in educational innovation and find some answers to a myriad of educational problems. Deals with the teacher's role in change and with societal values.

4. Miles, Matthew B., editor. *Innovation in Education*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. 690 pp.

   Details several case studies by people who . . . "have been involved in the educational revolution for more than a generation." It describes not only the successes but the failures in the cases reviewed.

5. Sarason, Seymour B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.* Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971. 246 pp.

As the title suggests, this book offers an extensive view of change. Contains some chapters dealing with teachers, their dilemmas, and the goals of change. The Dewey School and the process of change are also discussed.

National Education Association

Saylor, Galen J., editor. *The School of the Future NOW.* Washington, D.C. Order from: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1972. 136 pp. Single copy $3.75. (Stock #17920).

Educators present facets of urgent reforms that are needed now to prepare for the future. Contributors focus on the total school program and present some practical examples.

Negotiations for the Improvement of the Profession: A Handbook for Local Teachers Association Negotiators. The Association, Washington, D.C. Order from: Publications-Sales Section. Single copy $5.00. (Stock #381-11978).

This publication offers "assistance to those associations wishing to extend negotiation to areas of professional development and instruction," and contains separate sections on "Instruction," "Personnel Policies," "Evaluation," "Continuing Education," and "Educational Development Councils."

Caution: intended as a training document for those interested in sample negotiation language. It is useful to those who have been through a training program where this handbook was used.

Periodicals

1. *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan* in 1971 and 1972 published several articles which particularly relate to innovations and educational change. Many of these would be of interest to leaders and the general membership of the local education association.

2. Beckerman, Marvin M. "Are Teachers Against Innovations?" *School and Community: Missouri State Journal* 58:14, December 1971.

A survey of teacher's attitudes toward educational innovations. Gives results of the survey.

3. Morrison, Donald E. "Innovative Teaching Interviews " *Today's Education* 61:22-8, March 1972.

Past president Morrison interviews several teachers who discuss new approaches being tried in several schools. Teachers note some barriers that keep them from trying desired changes.

4. Simmons, N. Gayle. "After Innovations, What Then?" *School and Community: Missouri State Journal* 58:28, March 1972.

The author relates this article to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and justifies his argument with several examples.

nea council on instruction and professional development

The Council is broadly representative of the united teaching profession and serves as an advisory group to NEA governing bodies and to the NEA Instruction and Professional Development staff. Council members, who are appointd by the NEA president for three-year terms, provide IPD staff a continuing dialogue with practitioners.

Melvin Leasure (Council Chairman)
Elementary Teacher
31155 Milton
Madison Heights, Michigan 48071

Min Koblitz (Council Vice-Chairman)
Elementary Teacher
32 Jefferson Road
Scarsdale, New York 10583

Luis Cano
High School Teacher
6301 Calhoun—#6
Houston, Texas 77021

Joan Jacobson
Junior High Teacher
4345 North 99th Street
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin 53222

Robert Lipscomb
High School Teacher
1414 Big Cove Road
Huntsville, Alabama 35801

Idella Lohmann
Professor of Education
2102 University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

NEA Executive Committee Liaison
George G. Gumeson
Junior College Teacher
6500 Soquel Drive
Aptos, California 95003

Marjorie Lowman
Elementary Principal
Schneider School
Farmer City, Illinois 61842

Elizabeth McGonigle
Elementary Teacher
16 Beachurst Drive
Cape May, New Jersey 08204

Doris Ray
High School Teacher
1209 Tenth Avenue
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Donald M. Sharpe
Director, Secondary Student Teaching
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 48708

Robert Threatt
Coordinator of Student Teaching
123 San Michael
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

Darlene Wilson
Elementary Teacher
2265 Camino Rey
Fullerton, California 92633

Student Representative
David Currier
Antioch Graduate Student
Post Office Box 161
Henniker, New Hampshire 03242